

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ACCU-SPEC ELECTRONIC)
SERVICES, INC.,)
Plaintiff)

v.)

CIVIL ACTION NO. 03-394 ERIE

CENTRAL TRANSPORT)
INTERNATIONAL, INC. and)
LOGISTICS PLUS, INC.,)
Defendants)

HEARING ON DEFENDANT'S CENTRAL TRANSPORT INTERNATIONAL, INC.'S
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Proceedings held before the HONORABLE
SEAN J. McLAUGHLIN, U.S. District Judge,
in Courtroom C, U.S. Courthouse, Erie,
Pennsylvania, on Wednesday, December 8, 2004.

APPEARANCES:

THOMAS A. PENDLETON, Esquire, appearing on
behalf of the Plaintiff.

JEFFREY D. COHEN, Esquire, appearing on behalf
of Defendant Central Transport International,
Inc.

W. JOHN KNOX, Esquire, appearing on behalf of
Defendant Logistics Plus, Inc.

Ronald J. Bench, RMR - Official Court Reporter

EXHIBIT
H

1 if I could look at my file very quickly.

2 THE COURT: All right.

3 MR. PENDLETON: The authority begins with the case
4 of Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association, Inc. v. New
5 Prime, Inc.

6 THE COURT: The cite?

7 MR. PENDLETON: 192 F.3d 778.

8 THE COURT: What does it stand for?

9 MR. PENDLETON: It stands for the proposition that
10 under Section 14704(a)(2) authorizes private parties to sue for
11 damages for carrier conduct in violation of the regulations
12 promulgated under this part. Meaning the part dealing with
13 motor carrier conduct.

14 THE COURT: All right. Now, when you say carrier
15 conduct, do you mean like negligence which causes damage to
16 something?

17 MR. PENDLETON: Well, the regulations which are
18 issued under this part, deal in pertinent part with carrier
19 investigation of claims.

20 THE COURT: So, for instance, is your theory that
21 Central was deficient in its manner or method of investigating
22 the loss, therefore, you're entitled to attorney's fees?

23 MR. PENDLETON: Absolutely.

24 THE COURT: Is that the essence of the claim?

25 MR. PENDLETON: Yes.

1 THE COURT: How is that, just assuming that that
2 theoretically could be, how does one ferret out those facts and
3 who is the fact finder, do you have to have a jury trial on
4 that or a non-jury trial on that. First of all, I don't think
5 he accepts the proposition you get fees at all, at a minimum.
6 You would say, Mr. Cohen, I presume, that you didn't do
7 anything wrong in the manner or method in which you
8 investigated the loss?

9 MR. COHEN: Absolutely, yes.

10 THE COURT: That comes as no surprise, be that as it
11 may. How do I resolve that claim -- if there's disputed issues
12 of material fact?

13 MR. PENDLETON: I know that there are jury trials
14 under the Carmack Amendment. I don't know because this
15 amendment --

16 THE COURT: Probably has never been done before.

17 MR. PENDLETON: Well, this particular amendment to
18 the ICC, I'm sorry, which abolished the Interstate Commerce
19 Commission, was only six years ago. So the reason why there is
20 a private cause of action, as explained by the New Prime case,
21 is because there isn't another body, such as the ICC, any
22 longer to address these issues of when a carrier does not
23 properly investigate a claim.

24 THE COURT: Let's go back to the main point.

25 MR. PENDLETON: Sure. If I could make one more

1 point regarding another case.

2 THE COURT: All right.

3 MR. PENDLETON: It's the case of Owner-Operator
4 Independent Drivers --

5 THE COURT: I live by citations?

6 MR. PENDLETON: It's 2004 WL 115155 (N.D.of IL.
7 2004).

8 THE COURT: What does it say?

9 MR. PENDLETON: The same issue regarding a private
10 cause of action --

11 THE COURT: For attorney's fees?

12 MR. PENDLETON: Was addressed in detail. And a
13 blanket motion to dismiss was filed, it was denied, including
14 the issue of attorney's fees, that there was no order
15 dismissing the attorney's fees.

16 THE COURT: Was that actually joined as an issue,
17 the propriety of, did it just slip in -- are you saying it
18 supports your position by silence?

19 MR. PENDLETON: I think it supports certainly the
20 position by silence because if there was no claim for
21 attorney's fees, the court could have dismissed the claim on
22 the Rule 12(b)(6) motion.

23 THE COURT: What if they didn't move to dismiss the
24 claim -- who knows, all right, I got your point. Let's go to
25 the main point, well, another point. Where do you fall on this